REMARKS

Claims 2, 6-8, 25-36, 47, 49-51, 53-58, and 60-62 are pending in the present application. Independent claims 2, 6, and 57 are amended. Claims 58 and 60-62 have been withdrawn from consideration as be directed to a non-elected species. The present application, as amended, includes seven independent claims 2, 6-8, 49, 50, and 57.

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 8, and 55 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akram (U.S. 6,300,163) in combination with Watanabe et al. (U.S. 2002/0074669), Kweon et al. (U.S. 5,656,856) and Suzuki et al. (U.S. 5,532,910). The Examiner also rejected claims 7, 49-51, 54, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akram (U.S. 2002/0079573) in combination with Watanabe et al. (U.S. 2002/0074669), Kweon et al. (U.S. 5,656,856) and Suzuki et al. (U.S. 5,532,910). The Examiner also rejected claim 53 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akram (U.S. 2002/0079573) in combination with Watanabe et al. (U.S. 2002/0074669), Kweon et al. (U.S. 5,656,856) and Suzuki et al. (U.S. 5,532,910) as applied to claim 7 and further in combination with Spielberger et al. (U.S. 6,005,778). The Examiner states that both Akram references disclose every limitation except the limitation of at least one decoupling capacitor conductively coupled to at least one of said first and second semiconductor dies or wherein a thickness dimension of said decoupling capacitor is accommodated in a space defined by a thickness dimension of one of said first semiconductor die, said second semiconductor die, or a topographic contact.

Since both Akram references (U.S. 6,300,163 and U.S. 2002/0079573) are 35 U.S.C. 102(e)/103 references, they may be overcome by a proper showing that the application and the references were, at the time the invention was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same person(s) or organization(s) in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 103(c). Accordingly, Applicants state that the present application (U.S. 09/804,051) and the Akram references (U.S. 6,300,163 and U.S. 2002/0079573) were, at the time the invention was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to Micron Technology, Inc. as evidenced by the following assignments on record at the USPTO:

- the present application (U.S. 09/804,051) - Reel/Frame 011782/0797
- U.S. 6,300,163 to Akram - Reel/Frame 8069/0276; and

- U.S. 2002/0079573 to Akram - Reel/Frame 010223/0315.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections to claims 6, 7, 8, 49-51, and 53-56 should be withdrawn.

The Examiner also rejected claims 2, 6, 25-36, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkateshwaran (U.S. 6,388,336), Watanabe et al. (U.S. 2002/0074669), Kweon et al. (U.S. 5,656,856) in combination with Suzuki et al. (U.S. 5,532,910). The Examiner also rejected claim 47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkateshwaran (U.S. 6,388,336), Watanabe et al. (U.S. 2002/0074669), Kweon et al. (U.S. 5,656,856) and Suzuki et al. (U.S. 5,532,910) as applied to claim 6 and further in combination with Spielberger et al. (U.S. 6,005,778). The Examiner states that Venkateshwaran discloses a multiple semiconductor assembly comprising: a first semiconductor die (21a) a second semiconductor die (25a), and an intermediate substrate 22c positioned between the first and second dies (FIG. 2).

Applicants have amended independent claims 2, 6, and 57 to recite that the intermediate substrate includes "a network of conductive contacts formed thereon". Venkateshwaran discloses that the intermediate substrate (22c), as defined by the Examiner, is a lead (e.g., 22c, FIG. 2) of a lead frame (22a). However, Venkateshwaran does not disclose a network of conductive contacts formed on its intermediate substrate. Moreover, as disclosed in the Venkateshwaran specification (col. 8, line 16), the leads are "made solely of metal". Since the leads of Venkateshwaran are made from a conductive material, there would be no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to place a network of contacts on the leads (22c) of Venkateshwaran. Applicants submit that neither Venkateshwaran nor any of the other cited references disclose or suggest a network of conductive contacts formed on the intermediate substrate. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 2, 6, and 57 be withdrawn. As claims 25-36 depend from allowable independent claims 2, 6, and 57, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to resolve efficiently any formal matters

or to discuss any aspects of the application or of this response. Otherwise, early notification of allowable subject matter is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

DINSMORE & SHOHL L.L.P.

By _____
Paul M. Ulrich
Registration No. 46,404

One Dayton Centre
One South Main Street, Suite 1300
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2023
Telephone: (937) 449-6407
Facsimile: (937) 223-0724
e-mail: paul.ulrich@dinslaw.com

33934v1
40509-125